

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From Japanese Patent Office
(INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY)

To: HAYASE, Kenichi HAYASE & CO. 13F, NISSAY SHIN-OSAKA Bldg., 3-4-30, Miyahara, Yodogawa-ku, Osaka-shi, Osaka 532-0003 JAPAN	<p style="text-align: center;">PCT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WRITTEN OPINION OF THE ISA (PCT Rule 43bis)</p> <hr/> <p>Date of Mailing 5 July 2005</p>
---	---

Applicant's or agent's file reference P37828-P0	See item 2 below for the subsequent procedure	
International application No. PCT/JP2005/001719	International filing date 4 February 2005	Priority date 5 February 2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) Int. Cl. ⁷ H04N5/44, H04L9/10, G06F12/14		
Applicant Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of report with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 43.2.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

OMISSION (2 and 3)

Date of completion of this opinion 14 June 2005
--

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP Japanese Patent Office	Authorized officer Telephone No.
--	---

TRANSLATION of related part of Form PCT/ISA/237

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE ISA

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/001719

I . Basis of the opinion

1. This opinion has been drawn on the basis of the language of international application, unless otherwise indicated below.

OMISSION(2, 3, and 4)

V Reasoned statement under Rule 43,2.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N)	Claims 1-10	YES
	Claims NONE	NO
Inventive Step(IS)	Claims 1-10	YES
	Claims NONE	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims 1-10	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Document 1: JP 2003-186753 A (Canon Inc.), 2003.07.04, whole text, all figures (no family)
 Document 2: JP 2002-41361 A (Sharp Corporation), 2002.02.08, whole text, all figures (no family)
 Document 3: JP 2001-84176 A (Denso Corporation), 2001.03.30, whole text, all figures (no family)
 Document 4: JP 10-105473 A (Tokico Ltd.), 1998.04.24, whole text, all figures (no family);
 Document 5: JP 11-238017 A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), 1999.08.31, whole text, all figures (no family)

The documents 1-4 relate to a so-called anti-tamper technique, and show general technical standards in which a memory or an arithmetic mechanism holding a program to perform predetermined functions is contained in a casing, and the program is deleted or the arithmetic function is disabled when the casing is opened.

The document 5 shows a general technical standard relating to a television receiver that is provided with a means for inhibiting illegal access to internal information for performing encryption.

Claims 1-4

A television device having a decoding circuit and a display unit that are included in one casing, which cuts off supply of voltage to the decoding circuit when a cover of the casing is open, cannot be derived from the documents 1-5, and therefore, novelties and inventive steps of the inventions of Claims 1-4 cannot be denied.

Claims 5-7

None of the documents 1-5 discloses the technical idea that, in a device provided with a means that performs discharge when a casing cover is opened, the number of times a condenser is discharged is stored, and access is inhibited according to this number of times, and therefore, novelties and inventive steps of the inventions of Claims 5-7 cannot be denied by these documents.

Claims 8-10

None of the documents 1-5 discloses the technical idea that, when a casing cover is opened and closed, IDs of an electronic device before and after the opening and closing of the cover are compared to determine whether illegal analysis or the like is carried out or not, and therefore, novelties and inventive steps of the inventions of Claims 8-10 cannot be denied by these documents.